

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 5-7, 9, and 14-16 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

**I. Summary of Examiner Interview**

Applicants thank the examiner for the examiner interview held on Tuesday, April 25, 2006 between the undersigned attorney and the examiner. The filing dates between the reference and the present patent application was discussed. The examiner agreed that the reference does not apply because the present patent application has a filing date before that of the reference. The examiner asked the Applicants to file a response to the Office Action regarding this matter. No other issues were discussed.

**II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation; Claims 5-7, 9, and 14-16**

The examiner has rejected claims 5-7, 9, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Quatrano et al., Copy Server for Collaboration and Electronic Commerce, U.S. Patent No. 7,010,571, March 7, 2006 (hereinafter "*Quatrano*"). *Quatrano* is inapplicable because Applicants claim foreign priority benefits under Title 35, United States Code, § 119 for this application. The present application is a divisional of parent application U.S. Patent \_\_\_\_\_ (serial number 09/578,107), filed on May 24, 2000, which is entitled "Method and System for Changing a Collaboration Client Behavior According to Context." The parent application claimed foreign priority benefits to foreign application number 11-170197, which was filed on June 16, 1999. All requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 119 were met for the parent application. Therefore, the present patent application also has the benefit of foreign priority as claimed by the parent application, and therefore, claims a filing date of June 16, 1999.

*Quatrano* is a continuation application, filed originally on July 6, 1999. However, the foreign priority date of the present application is June 16, 1999, which is before the original filing date of *Quatrano*. Therefore, the reference does not meet the requirements of a 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 5-7, 9, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome.

### III. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over *Quatrano* and is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: April 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Hope Shimabuku  
Reg. No. 57,072  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants